

REMARKSNew Claims

Applicant has added a new set of claims (claims 11-19 as shown above in the listing of the claims). As stated above, no new matter has been added.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has stated that claims 5-8 and 10 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C §112, second paragraph, rejection. Specifically the Examiner states “[t]he prior art of record, including the disclosure of Vijaykumar, has not taught or render obvious deferring updates by agents external to the processor until completion of the step of committing. Vijaykumar has taught deferring updates to memory external to the processor (i.e. updates from local instructions), but has not taught deferring updates by agents external to the processor. Therefore, Vijaykumar has not taught claim 5.” (Examiner’s Office Action, page 5)

Applicant acknowledges this statement and will expand upon it below in the remarks regarding the 35 U.S.C §102(b) rejection of claims 1, 3, and 4 below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 5-8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has made amendments to claims 5 and 7 in light of the specific reasons the Examiner has pointed out. Applicant believes these amendments correct any indefiniteness issues reflected in claims 5-8 and 10 and respectfully requests the Examiner remove the 35 U.S.C §112 for pending claims 5-8 and 10.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, and 4 under 35 U.S.C §102(b), as being anticipated by Vijaykumar et al., “Transient-Fault Recovery using Simultaneous Multithreading” (“Vijaykumar”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant asserts that the cited reference fails to anticipate Applicant’s invention as claimed in claims 1, 3, and 4.

The Examiner has stated in the office action that there is allowable subject matter because “[t]he prior art of record, including the disclosure of Vijaykumar, has not taught or render obvious *deferring updates by agents external to the processor until completion of the step of committing.*” (Examiner’s Office Action, page 5) (Emphasis added) Applicant recognizes this and has amended independent claim 1 to more accurately reflect this limitation within independent claim 5. Applicant has also amended independent claim 5 to more succinctly capture this limitation. Applicant’s claim 1 teaches and claims as follows:

“A method comprising executing corresponding instruction threads in parallel as a leading thread and a trailing thread, speculatively saving a result from a first instruction executed in the leading thread and speculatively saving a result from a second instruction corresponding to

the first instruction executed in the trailing thread to a memory having extensions for speculative storage, comparing the results saved in the memory, committing a single set of instructions based on the compared result, and deferring updates from one or more external agents to one or more memory locations accessed by the instruction threads until the single set of instructions has been committed.” (Applicant’s claim 1) (Emphasis added)

As stated by the Examiner, the amended limitation in Applicant’s claim 1 of *deferring updates from one or more external agents to one or more memory locations accessed by the instruction threads until the single set of instructions has been committed* is not taught by Vijaykumar or elsewhere in the prior art. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Vijaykumar.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from and further limit independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons advanced above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Vijaykumar does not anticipate claims 3 and 4.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the 35 U.S.C §102(b) rejection of claims 1, 3, and 4.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account Number 50-4238. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Derek J. Reynolds at (916) 356-5374.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: April 28, 2008

/Derek J. Reynolds/

Derek J. Reynolds

Reg. No.: 60,104

Intel Corporation
c/o Intellevate, LLC
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(916)356-5358